

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The final Office Action dated August 24, 2006 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 1, 2, 4-9 and 12-28 are pending in the present application, of which claims 6, 8, 16 and 21-28 are withdrawn as the result of an earlier restriction requirement. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 11-14 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oh et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,130,729) in view of Liu et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,573,965), Von Gutfeld et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,055,035) and Kishimoto et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,515,718); claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oh et al. in view of Liu et al., Von Gutfeld et al. and Tanaka et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,603,528); and claims 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oh et al. in view of Liu et al., Von Gutfeld et al. and Kim et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,100,953).

The rejection of claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 11-14 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oh et al. in view of Liu et al., Von Gutfeld et al. and Kishimoto et al. is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 1 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 1 recites a combination of elements including, for example, "...wherein the second height of the sealant structure is higher than the first height of the dielectric frame, and a height difference between the first height and the second height is more than 1 μ m." None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 and claims 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 11-14 and 20, which depend therefrom, are allowable over the cited references.

The Examiner combines four references to reject claim 1. In particular, the Examiner cites Kishimoto et al. as teaching the aforementioned features recited in claim 1, stating on page 8 of the Office Action that "Kishimoto discloses the motivation to optimize the height of a dielectric structure is to account for the relative dielectric constants of the respective components... the height is made sufficient to achieve the desired dielectric effect given the relative dielectric strength of the material used."

As previously argued, assuming *arguendo* that Kishimoto et al. may teach a method for optimizing the height of a dielectric structure, it does not disclose or suggest the height relationship between the sealant structure and the dielectric frame in an LCD device, which is required to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103. In the present application, a height difference between the sealant structure and the dielectric frame is more than 1µm to minimize or prevent, for example, bubbles generated in the liquid crystal of the LCD device. See TABLE 1 of the present application. If the Examiner takes an Official Notice for the aforementioned features recited in claim 1, Applicant respectfully traverses this Official Notice and requests for a documentary evidence. See MPEP §2144.03(c).

In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that as recited in claim 1, a dielectric frame is formed on the second substrate and a liquid crystal is dispensed on the first substrate, which is different from Liu et al. in which dielectric frames are formed on both substrates. As a result, as discussed in the specification of the present application, it would take a longer time to smoothly inject and uniformly distribute liquid crystal between the two substrates of Liu et al. as compared with the claimed invention.

The rejection of claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oh et al. in view of Liu et al., Von Gutfeld et al. and Tanaka et al. is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Because Tanaka et al. fails to cure the deficient teaching of Oh et al., Liu et al. and Von Gutfeld et al., claim 15 is allowable over the cited references.

The rejection of claims 17-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oh et al. in view of Liu et al., Von Gutfeld et al. and Kim et al. is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Because Kim et al. fails to cure the deficient teaching of Oh et al., Liu et al. and Von Gutfeld et al., claims 17-19 are allowable over the cited references.

Applicant believes the application is in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited. If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37

C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: November 21, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Eric J. Nuss

Registration No.: 40,106

McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

1900 K Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 496-7500

Attorneys for Applicant